

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8, and 10-18 are in the application.

As required in said Official Action a brief description of Figure 15 has been inserted on page 5. The Examiner is accordingly requested to withdraw the objection to the disclosure.

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lack of antecedent support for "advisors" in paragraph (c)(ii) line 3, in claim 1. Claims 7 and 9 were also rejected thereunder as not further defining the system since the claims were drawn to a system and not a method. In response thereto claims 7 and 9 have been cancelled and original paragraph (c)(ii) has been deleted (together with "advisors"). The Examiner is accordingly requested to review and withdraw the rejection of the claims based on 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao in view of McIlroy et al., Lavin et al. Iliff. In response thereto it is noted that contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the cited references relate to providing medical information or possible a treatment recommendation. The references do not disclose or even suggest a method or a system for assisting a user in developing, administering and monitoring healthcare plans for patients having multiple conditions, e.g., col. 2, lines 38-45 of the primary Joao reference (specifically cited by the Examiner) states:

"The apparatus and method of the present invention facilitates the creation and management of a comprehensive healthcare processing system which can manage patient and client records, doctor and other provider records, healthcare insurance and/or payer records, and thereby provide an apparatus, system and methods for providing a variety and a multitude of healthcare information processing applications, processes and services." *See also*

The present claims have been amended to emphasize the parameters of the system as being for developing, administering and monitoring **healthcare plans**. Claim 1 has been amended to more positively claim elements of the system rather than capability. New claims 10-18, specific to the method, have been added (including the substance of original claims 7 and 9 which the Examiner has indicated were more appropriate to method claims). None of the references, either alone or in combination disclose the claimed method or the system relative to healthcare plans, with the positive elements claimed. The Examiner is accordingly requested to review and withdraw the rejection of the claims based on the cited prior art.

In view of the above amendments and discussion it is submitted that the present

Patent Application  
Attorney Docket No. PC11049

claims are patentable over the cited prior art and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Date:

3/18/03

Pfizer, Inc  
Patent Department, 20th Floor  
235 East 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10017-5755  
(212) 733-6475

Respectfully submitted,

  
Israel Nissenbaum  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,582